

REMARKS

The last Office Action has been carefully considered.

It is noted that the claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over the patent to Takaoka '683.

The claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the patent to Takashima '472.

Finally, claims 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the patent to Tsuzuki.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to.

In connection with the Examiner's objection to the abstract of the disclosure, applicants have submitted a new abstract of the disclosure in compliance with the Examiner's requirements. The Examiner's grounds for the rejection of the claims over the art has been carefully considered.

The claims have been retained as they were, since it is believed that the claims currently on file clearly and patentably distinguish the present invention from the prior art.

Before the analysis of the prior art it is believed to be advisable to analyze claim 1, the broadest claim on file, in detail.

Claim 1 defines a drive arrangement for at least one auxiliary system of a motor vehicle having an internal combustion engine, at least one supplementary motor and a gear. The gear of the drive arrangement is a planetary gear which is operatively connected to the engine and the at least one supplementary motor each via a respective input shaft, while it is connected to the auxiliary system via an output shaft.

It is critically important that the present invention deals with the auxiliary system of a motor vehicle, for example a generator, a climate control compressor, a servo pump, a water pump, etc. as disclosed on page 4, lines 3-4 of the specification.

As for the references applied by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that a hybrid drive with an internal combustion engine and one or

two electric engines is described in any of the references applies by the Examiner against the original claims. These engines are coupled by a planetary gear. The references do not describe a drive arrangement for at least one auxiliary system of a motor vehicle.

This is an important and critical difference between the present invention and the references.

None of the references teaches the above mentioned new features of the present invention which are now defined in claim 1. These features can not be derived from the references as a matter of obviousness, since the references do not contain any hint or suggestion for such a modification.

It is therefore believed that claim 1 should be considered as patentably distinguishing over the art and should be allowed.

As for the dependent claims, these claims depend on claim 1, they share its presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that they should be allowed as well.

Reconsideration and allowance of present application is most respectfully requested.

The Examiner's attention is also respectfully directed to the fact that the applicants again object to the Examiner's election requirement. In accordance with the PCT rule, in a single application several species of several inventions can be retained if they have single general inventive idea. This is exactly the case in this present application, since the various species and/or inventions are united by a single general inventive idea defined in Claim 1. Therefore, it is requested to prosecute all claims currently on file.

Should the Examiner require or consider it advisable that the specification, claims and/or drawings be further amended or corrected in formal respects in order to place this case in condition for final allowance, then it is respectfully requested that such amendments or corrections be carried out by Examiner's Amendment, and the case be passed to issue. Any costs involved should be charged to the deposit account of the undersigned (No. 19-4675). Alternatively, should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, he is invited to telephone the undersigned (at 631-549-4700).

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Striker
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27233